

Remarks/Arguments

Amendments to the Claims

At the onset, Applicants courteously submit that the amended claims listed above represent amendments to the claims as the claims appeared prior to submission of the Reply to *Ex Parte Quayle* dated November 21, 2006, as those amendments were not entered.

The Objection to Claims 2, 3, 5, 11, 14-16, 20, and 25

The Examiner has objected to Claims 2, 3, 5, 11, 14-16, 20, 25 because of minor informalities. More specifically, the Examiner has objected to: Claims 2, 11, and 15 because it was unclear whether “an outer front wall” as set forth in Claims 2 and 15 and “an inner front wall” as set forth in Claim 11 were part of “a front wall” as set forth in Claim 1; Claims 3 and 16 because “the clamping lever” recited in these claims should be, “the at least one clamping lever”; Claim 5 because “the knife support element” lacked positive antecedent basis; Claims 14 and 25 because it was insufficiently clear whether they were directed to a collection element or a rotary microtome; and, Claim 20 because “the inner front wall” lacked positive antecedent basis.

Applicants have amended Claims 2 and 15 to positively recite the structural arrangement of “an outer front wall” relative to “a front wall”, have amended Claim 9 to positively recite the structural arrangement of “an inner front wall” relative to “a front wall”, and have amended Claims 11 and 20 to positively recite the structural arrangement of “an inner front wall” relative to “a front wall” and “an outer front wall”, thereby clarifying the distinction between and structural arrangements of the front wall, the outer front wall and the inner front wall. Applicants courteously submit that the above listed amendments to Claims 2, 9, 11, 15 and 20 maintain the scope of the claims as originally filed, as the limitations of “an outer front wall” and “an inner front wall” were introduced in Claims 2, 9, 11, 15 and 20 and were not introduced in independent Claim 1.

Attorney Docket No. LNUP:113US
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/823,297
Reply to Office Action of September 25, 2006
& Office Communication dated March 9, 2007
Date: April 9, 2007

Claims 3 and 16 have been amended to recite “the at least one clamping lever,” as recommended by the Examiner. Additionally, Applicants have amended Claim 5 to recite positive antecedent basis for “knife support element” and “knife,” and have amended Claims 14 and 25 to clarify that both Claims 14 and 25 are intended to be directed to a device for a rotary microtome and not merely a rotary microtome. Lastly, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 19, 20 and 25 to recite “inner side walls” and/or “outer side walls” instead of “inner side wall” and “outer side wall”, respectively, as requested by the Examiner in the Office Communication dated March 9, 2007.

Applicants courteously submit that Claims 2, 3, 5, 11, 14-16, 20, 25 have been amended according to Examiner’s recommendations, and are now in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No. LNUP:113US
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/823,297
Reply to Office Action of September 25, 2006
& Office Communication dated March 9, 2007
Date: April 9, 2007

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments submitted with this Reply place the present application in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested. The Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney of record if such contact will facilitate an efficient examination and allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Atkinson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Robert C. Atkinson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,584
Simpson & Simpson, PLLC
5555 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221-5406
Telephone No. 716-626-1564
Facsimile No. 716-626-0366

Dated: April 9, 2007

RCA/